

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/981,346	10/16/2001	Kazumi Fujikura	SHO 1006-01US	5500
28327	7590 10/22/2004		EXAMINER	
THE LAW OFFICE OF JOHN A. GRIECCI			PITARO, RYAN F	
703 PIER AVE., SUITE B #657 HERMOSA BEACH, CA 90254			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2174	
			DATE MAILED: 10/22/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/981,346	FUJIKURA, KAZUMI	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan F Pitaro	2174	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a in - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r reply within the statutory minimum of thir od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16	October 2001.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ T	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	•	·	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the applicating 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with definition 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	accepted or b) objected to he drawing(s) be held in abeyar rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form P1O-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/981,346 Page 2

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 –11 have been examined.

Specification

- The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities on page 5 line
 the applicant discloses a second invention. Only one invention is allowed per application, a suggestion would be to disclose embodiments instead of inventions.
- 3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 33 lines 23-24 the applicant discloses the transmission button P shown in Figure 7 and 8, wherein it should read Figures 6 and 7.Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.
- 6. Regarding claims 3-11 the phrase "such as" renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrases are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2174

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 8. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chester et al ("Chester", Excel 97 Fourth Edition).

As per independent claim 1, Chester discloses a server which is connected to a plurality of terminals and exchanges data with the terminals, (page 35; ... when another user on the network.), wherein a display screen of each of the terminals displays a paste field to which a multiple item display made up of a set of single item displays, each representing a single matter, is to be pasted, and a single matter display window which enables selection of a single matter corresponding to a single item display included in the multiple item display and definite display of the selected single matter (First figure on page 115; where all cells are fields which accept a paste).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Chester discloses the multiple item display is made by means of arranging a plurality of single item displays in a row (first figure on page 115).

As per independent claim 3, Chester discloses a method which enables collective input of input item information pertaining to a plurality of input items prepared in a predetermined format, (Page 738, *text import wizard*) on a web page by means of operation of a WEB terminal (Page 736; *copied into excel using the clipboard* and page 727; *The Web Form Wizard*), the method comprising the steps of: prompting entry of a

Art Unit: 2174

delimiter for a plurality of input items at the time of collective input of the input information, therby distinguishing to the input delimiter and enabling perception of the collectively-input a plurality of items in a divided manner on a per input item basis (Page 738 Delimiters other than commas).

As per independent claim 4, Chester discloses a control method comprising an operation for preparing, beforehand, a plurality of input items to be input in a predetermined format, (Page 738; *text import wizard*), on a WEB terminal as input item information formed by consecutively arranging the input items in no particular order, and an operation for enabling collective input of the plurality of input items in a row on a WEB page of a WEB server connectable to the WEB terminal by way of the Internet through pasting operation of the WEB terminal (Page 736; *Copied using the clipboard* page 727; *Web Form Wizard*) wherein a plurality of type selection display windows equal in number with the input items are arranged in parallel with the input items in the vicinity of an input field where the input items are to be collectively input in a row (Pages 277-78, Figure10.3 and 1st figure on page 278; *inherent that a drop-down selection menu can be arranged in a row see similar example figure 17.5*) for each of the input items collectively input in the form of a row, type is input to the corresponding type selection display window (Page 270; *Custom Validation*).

As per claim 5, Chester discloses an input control method which enables collective input of input item information constituted of a plurality of input items previously prepared for placing an order for products by a WEB terminal into a WEB page from the WEB terminal (Page 727; Web form Wizard) in a predetermined format

Art Unit: 2174

(page 738; Text import wizard), through a pasting operation at the time of input of the input items into the WEB page of a WEB server by way of the WEB terminal (Page 736; copied using the clipboard), wherein the input items mixedly comprising a plurality of types of input item information items (Page 280; Figure 10.5); the WEB server prompts the user of the WEB terminal to enter a delimiter for the plurality of input items at the time of collective input of input items and can separately perceive the collectively-input input items on a per-unit item basis by means of subjecting the input delimiter to discrimination processing (Page 738; Working with delimiters other than commas); and the WEB server arranges type selection display windows for user in selectively inputting input type, which windows are equal in number with the input items, in the vicinity of an input field on the WEB page (Page 727; web form wizard) where the input types of the input items are collectively input in a row during the collective input of input items (inherent example on page 457 similar to Fig 17.5) thereby prompting selective input of input type into the type selection window by way of the WEB terminal, and converts input information into a format formed by arrangement of uniform input items in accordance with the input type entered in the type selection display window, for ensuring consistency with information entered into the WEB page from another WEB terminal (Page 279; Custom Validation).

Claims 6,9 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected to under similar rationale.

Claims 7,10 are individually similar in scope to claim 4, and are therefore rejected to under similar rationale.

Claims 8,11 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected to under similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Bowman et al (US# 6,751,736) teaches an E-commerce web page.
- Kraft et al (US# 6,084,585) teaches pull-down menus and input fields.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Pitaro whose telephone number is (703) 605-1205. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday, and every other Friday. The Patent Office is moving, after mid October the new telephone number where Ryan Pitaro can be reached is (571) 272 – 4071.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/981,346

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro Patent Examiner Art Unit 2174

RFP

Wristine Rincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Page 7